

Application No. 09/607,839
Amendment "D" dated July 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2005

REMARKS

The latest Office Action, mailed May 5, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-15 and 27-35 in view of newly cited art, Courts and Gebauer.¹

All of the pending claims 1-15 and 27-35 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, it was unclear to the examiner what was in the request that is generated by the server application and sent to the decision engine. It was also unclear to the examiner how the decision engine knows to select content based on a client attribute if the request does not include the attribute and the request does not specify how the selection is to be made. Hopefully, the remarks and the clarifying amendments made by this paper will be found to adequately address and overcome these issues. Some of the claims were also objected to for minor informalities which have been fixed by claim amendment, by deleting objected to language and by providing adequate antecedent basis for claim terminology.

By this paper, claims 1-4, 7-9 and 27 have been amended, and claims 11 and 29 have been cancelled, such that claims 1-10, 12-15, 27-28 and 30-35 remain pending, of which claims 1, 9 and 27 are the only independent claims at issue.²

The present invention is generally directed to embodiments in which a decision engine is used to help create a document that is customized according to specified attributes associated with a user and in a way that script developers and site administrators do not need to concern themselves with the decision processes for customizing the document, when they write the scripts. According to the invention, changes to decision criteria are abstracted, such that they can be made at the decision engine, and without altering the structure of the scripts that are ultimately used to create the document. (Specification page 6, 15)

Claim 1, for example, recites a method that includes a server application receiving a request for a document, wherein the server application is configured to generate the document from a script. The server application then generates and sends a corresponding request to a

¹ Claims 1-15 and 27-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,076,108 (Courts et al.). Claims 1-15 and 27-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,662,343 (Gebauer). Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the claim amendments is found throughout the specification, including, but not limited to the disclosure found on pages 5-6 and 15-16.

Application No. 09/607,839
Amendment "D" dated July 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2005

decision engine, which is separate from the server application, to select customized content for the document based on at least one attribute of a client. The decision engine has access to the attribute independently of the server application, such that the request sent from the server application to the decision engine merely needs to specify that the decision engine is to identify appropriate content for a particular client on whatever decision criteria are available to the decision engine. Accordingly, as claimed, the request is sent without the server application specifying the attribute of the client or how the selection of content is to be made.

The decision engine, upon receiving the request, accesses the attribute of the client from an attribute provider and uses the attribute of the client to select content that the decision engine determines to be appropriate for the client from a plurality of available content. The decision engine then sends identification of the selected content to the server application.

The server application then, upon receiving the identification of selected content from the decision engine, creates the document and incorporates into the document the content that has been selected by the decision engine. The customized document is then sent to the client.

Claim 9 is directed to a similar method, but wherein the content selected by the decision engine is one portion of a script that is concatenated with another portion of a script by the server application. Claim 27 is directed to a corresponding computer program product for implementing the method of claim 9.

It will be appreciated, that by the forgoing, a customized document can be created with the use of a script, without the server application or script having the burden of making the decisions regarding customization or even have to include information that is used to make these decisions. (Specification, page 18, ll. 2-5). Accordingly, in this manner, customization is abstracted, such that when changes in customization criteria are made, they can be made at the decision engine, without having to manually change all of the multiple portions of a source code in the server applications or in the scripts that are used to create the document.

With specific regard to the Examiners 112 rejections regarding indefiniteness, it should now be apparent from the claim language what the request from the server application includes and that the decision engine is able to make the decision regarding what content to select based on an attribute without receiving it in the request. In particular, as claimed, the server application simply requests that the decision engine is to use whatever decision criteria are available to the decision engine to select appropriate content for a client (see specification page

Application No. 09/607,839
Amendment "D" dated July 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2005

6, ll. 6-7, as well as the rest of the disclosure for further discussion). The decision engine is able to independently access the decision criteria and client attribute, as claimed, for example, by accessing attribute providers that store the attributes of the client. The Examiner has previously suggested that a name can be an attribute. In this regard, Applicants point out that even if a client name or identifier is an attribute, the claims require that the decision engine uses an attribute to select the content that is not included in the request. The claims do not require, on the other hand, that the request cannot include any attribute. Accordingly, it is possible for the request to include a client name or identifier, but not include the attribute that is used to select the content. As disclosed in the specification, other attributes can include, but are not limited to, such things as a user language, country, age, level of subscription, etc.

In view of the foregoing, it should be appreciated that the cited art does not disclose or suggest a method or system in which a client engine selects content from a plurality of content that is appropriate for a client based on an attribute of the client that is not included in the request for content received from a separate server application and that is used to customize a web document.

Courts, for example, is directed to a system and method for maintaining a state of a user session (title) in which a session manager obtains session data from a global session server storing a master copy and then sends the session information to a render engine that builds a web page using the session information. (Col. 8, ll. 41-45). Although Courts discloses a session manager obtains a copy of data and sends it to a render engine to build a page. Courts does not, disclose or suggest that a decision engine disclose or suggest a method or system in which a client engine selects content from a plurality of content that is appropriate for a client based on an attribute of the client that is not included in the request for content received from a separate server application and that is used to customize a web document. Courts does disclose an attribute cache. However, this attribute cache merely provides "fast access to (security related) group access numbers and (document cache related) cache control enumeration." (Col. 6, ll. 53-55). Courts attribute cache should not, therefore, be considered analogous to the attribute providers of the present invention that provide attributes that are used to customize the selection of content from a plurality of content based on decision criteria of the decision engine, as claimed.

Application No. 09/607,839
Amendment "D" dated July 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2005

The other cited art, Gebaurer, also fails to compensate for the shortcomings of Courts. In particular, Gebaurer fails to disclose or suggest, alone or in combination with Courts, a method or system in which a client engine selects content from a plurality of content that is appropriate for a client based on an attribute of the client that is not included in the request for content received from a separate server application and that is used to customize a web document, as claimed. Instead, Gebaurer is directed to a system that functionally relates a plurality of transfers over an internet into an associated sequence of service requests, to replicate and generate corresponding database management system commands. (Summary, particularly Col. 3, ln. 55 thru Col. 4, ln. 44).

In view of the foregoing, the rejections of record are now moot, such that it is not necessary to address each of the other assertions of record in the last response. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of said assertions in the future. Furthermore, although the foregoing remarks are primarily directed to the independent claims, it will be appreciated that the dependent claims should also be found allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as provided above.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 26 day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCj:ppa
W:\14531\70\PPA000000457V001.DOC